REMARKS

Claims 1, 8, 20, 26, and 34 have been amended. Claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 20, 21, 26-35 and 37-50 remain pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks. Support for the amendments may be found at least at paragraph [0037] of Applicants' specification.

Examiner Interview Summary

On August 10, 2010, Examiner Hung Q. Pham and attorney for Applicants (Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255) participated in an Examiner Interview to discuss certain aspects of the current rejections. Based on the discussion Examiner Hung Q. Pham agreed that the claims would be allowable over the cited art if they were amended to include features relating to embedded executable code, similar to that discussed and described in paragraph [0037] of Applicant's specification. Accordingly, the above amendments should place the application in condition for allowance. Reasoning as discussed in the telephone interview is elaborated upon below.

Section 102(b) Rejection:

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, 20, 21, 26-28, 30-35 and 38-40 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Harrington (U.S. Patent 5,895,454). Applicant submits that the claims are allowable over the cited art for at least the following reasons.

With regard to claim 1, the cited art does not teach or suggest at least the features of *wherein the Web-page comprises embedded executable code that, when executed, is configured to cause said presentation device to transmit said data to said first network location, and wherein rendering of the Web-page by the presentation device causes execution of the embedded executable code such that the presentation device transmits the data to the first network location upon rendering of the Web-page*, in combination

with other features of the claim. The Office Action suggests that similar features are taught by Harrington.

Harrington relates to a method of effecting commerce in a networked computer environment in a computerized system (Harrington, abstract). More specifically, the portions of Harrington cited by the Office Action disclose a network for flow of information/data as well as physical goods. (Harrington, col. 3, line 64 to col. 4, line 9. As illustrated in FIG. 1 of Harrington, a database 10 and vendor site is connected to a network. A client browser 13 is connected to user 11 that is connected to the database 10 via a modem connection, and a server application is connected to the database 10. Thus, the client browser 13, the user 11 and the server application are coupled to the network and the vendor, via the database 10. With respect to FIG. 2, Harrington discloses that the database 10 contains information relating to vendor products, etc. (Harrington, col. 4, lines 9-12). During use, a user 11 specifies particular criteria which would be used by the database search engine 21 to provide a list of suitable websites which match the user's product/service criteria. (Harrington, col. 4, lines 11-15). If, while the user 11 is reviewing the products/services provided by a vendor 25, the user wishes to order or otherwise purchase a product/service he or she (generally) clicks on a "purchase" icon or button. (Harrington, col. 4, lines 26-29). If a user activates the "purchase" button (as an example of a purchase/selection notification means), the vendors modified website software 24 transmits a transaction notification (33 in FIG. 2) back to the database administration software 21. (Harrington, col. 4, lines 35-38). Notably, the presentation device, presumably the client browser application 13, does not transfer the data to the database. Instead, data is transmitted directly to the database from the vendor.

Accordingly, Harrington discloses an event that is activated by a purchase/selection, such as a user selecting a "purchase" button. In response to activating the event, a notification is transmitted from the vendor to the database. Harrington, however, does not disclose that rendering of a Web-page causes transmission of data, much less a Web-page that comprises embedded executable code that, when executed, is configured to cause a presentation device to transmit the data to a first network location.

Moreover, Harrington does not disclose transmission of data from <u>a presentation device</u> at a second network location to a database at a first network location. That is Harrington appears to at best disclose <u>direct</u> transfer of data <u>between the vendor and the database,</u> as opposed to transfer of data from a presentation device (e.g., a network location including a computer or digital presentation device where the Web–page is rendered) to a second network location where the database is located, much less the transfer being caused by rendering of a Web-page by the presentation device. The other cited art does not remedy these deficiencies. Accordingly, Harrington, taken alone or in hypothetical combination with the cited art does not teach or suggests at least the features of, "wherein the Web-page comprises embedded executable code that, when executed, is configured to cause said presentation device to transmit said data to said first network location, and wherein rendering of the Web-page by the presentation device causes execution of the embedded executable code such that the presentation device transmits the data to the first network location upon rendering of the Web-page," in combination with other features of the claim.

Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable over the cited art for at least these reasons.

Claim 8 recites a combination of features including, but not limited to:

> …wherein the Web-page comprises embedded executable code that, when executed, is configured to cause a device at the second network location to transmit said data to said first network location, and wherein rendering of the Web-page at the second network location causes execution of the embedded executable code such that the data is transmitted from the second network location to the interface upon rendering of the Web-page.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above.

Claim 20 recites a combination of features including, but not limited to:

> …wherein the Web-page comprises embedded executable code that, when executed, is configured to cause said presentation

device to transmit said data to said first network location, and wherein rendering of the Web-page causes execution of the embedded executable code such that the presentation device transmits the data to the computer device upon rendering of the Web-page.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above.

Claim 26 recites a combination of features including, but not limited to:

wherein the interactive catalog comprises embedded executable code that, when executed, is configured to cause said presentation device to transmit said selected data related to the products to said first network location, and wherein said rendering of the portion of the interactive catalog causes execution of the embedded executable code such that a device at the second network location to communicate the selected data related to the products from the second network location to the merchandising product database at the first network location such that, upon rendering of the portion of the interactive catalog, the selected data is communicated from the source product databases to the merchandising product database by way of the second network location without requiring a direct data transfer between the source product databases at the third network location and the merchandising product database at the first network location.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 26 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above.

Claim 34 recites a combination of features including, but not limited to:

...wherein said Web-page comprises embedded executable code that, when executed, is configured to cause said presentation device to transmit said product data to said first network location, and wherein rendering of said Web-page causes execution of the embedded executable code such that said presentation device [[to]] transmits said product data to said first network location upon rendering of said Web-page.

Applicants respectfully submit that claim 34 is allowable for at least reasons similar to those discussed above.

Applicants also assert that the rejections of numerous ones of the dependent claims are further unsupported by the cited art. Since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

Section 103(a) Rejections:

The Office Action rejected claims 29 and 37 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Musgrove et al. (U.S. Patent 6,535,880) (hereinafter "Musgrove"), and claims 41-50 as being unpatentable over Harrington in view of Trubey et al. (U.S. Publication 2002/0077930) (hereinafter "Trubey"). Applicants submit that the claims are allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons discussed above.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6067-41400/RCK.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/

Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: September 17, 2010